My testimony on HB 4714 June 11, 2013

Our federal government is fast becoming a socialist tyranny and Governor Snyder with your help is about to enable them to further that goal.

http://www.forbes.com/sites/paulroderickgregory/2012/01/22/is-president-obama-truly-a-socialist/

In an article in Forbes titled, *Is President Obama Truly A Socialist*, Paul Roderick Gregory summaries and compares Obama's goals with those of the *The November 2011*Declaration of Principles of the Party of European Socialists (PES). I've edited this for time to only include those that pertain to the PPACA and Medicaid expansion. They are as follows.

PES: The welfare state and state-provided universal access to education and health care are society's great achievements.

Obama: Favors universal access to health care and associated benefits as a critical expansion of the welfare state.

(I'll just add right here because this author didn't mention it but Common Core fits the education portion of this goal.)

PES: A strong and just society must ensure that the wealth generated by all is shared fairly as determined by the state.

Obama: Favors progressive taxes on the rich to redistribute income and wealth from winners to losers and to ensure that all pay their fair share. (As he has said: "When you spread the wealth around, it's good for everybody.")

PES: Collective responsibility makes society stronger when people work together, and all people are enabled to live a dignified life, free of poverty and protected from social risks in life.

Obama: Favors collective responsibility (as defined by the federal government) to protect all from social risks through food stamps, welfare programs, extended unemployment benefits, guaranteed health care, the bailing out of big companies, forcing renegotiation of mortgages, class action law suits, and other measures. (Instead of opportunity and incentive to succeed, no one is allowed to fail).

PES: A strong state must preserve the public good, guarantee the common interest, promote justice and solidarity and allow people to lead lives rich beyond material wealth, so that each individual's fulfillment is also part of a collective endeavor.

Obama: Advocates a strong state that offers the "positive right" of political and economic justice to its citizens. He complains that the U.S. Constitution is a "charter of negative liberties," that dictates what government "can't do to you, but it doesn't say what the federal government or the state government must do on your behalf."

Gregory ends his article by saying:

Our political discourse is conducted largely in the language of the left, to the disadvantage of conservatives. After all, who can oppose "fairness, justice, dignified life, or sustainable growth?" Only sophisticated observers understand that these are code words for something else. They are all excuses for the state to take from one group to give to another or to coerce people or businesses to do something they do not want to do otherwise. The more powerful the state, the greater the risk of state coercion under the guise of noble aims. Enhancing the size, scope, and power of the state vis-à-vis the private sector may be Obama's ultimate objective.

This country was founded on the principle that individuals should not be subject to the control of a powerful state. That founding idea has never before been in greater peril.

We are not a socialist country and you're duty is to keep us from becoming one. We had founders who saw these dangers in the mid to late 1700's. They wrote, fought and died for a document that I believe you all swore to uphold. Yes, I'm sure some of you are smirking if not openly on the inside because you know me and you know this is what I believe throughout my being and I will not stand by and let you throw our country into social Marxism if it's the last thing I do and it very well may be. Yes I take this that seriously. You should also. Let me remind you of your oath of office.

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of this state, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of according to the best of my ability. No other oath, affirmation, or any religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust."

The PPACA is a tool of socialism, as is Medicaid, Medicare, our Public Schools, of which my children attend, and many other things that happen because they are forced on us by the US Government. We have neglected our constitutional duty to push back the overreach by our federal government. We have all fallen down on the jobs given to us to do just that, to push back. That is the only way to keep an all too powerful central government in check. That is what you must do now with Medicaid Expansion. You must stop it!

I know you think you can put these stipulations out there in this bill and have them accepted but you cannot. The feds have taken down state after state's plans on anything that might actually work to encourage people off the Medicaid rolls. That indeed would be the best solution for everyone, including the person on it if it meant they were back on their feet and working making

decent money and picking up some pride along the way. That is where we should be trying to move. Not adding more people to this slavery of poverty.

But lest you think you will get any agreement with the feds on your conditions, take Connecticut a very blue state who already is feeling the strain of having all those college kids and other young people on their "government funded plan." They requested a waiver to include parent's income when determining if they could take some of these young people off the system as it's already strangling their state's financial situation. The answer was NO. As Jack McHugh puts it in a recent article, "Importantly, nothing in the law requires a state to extend Medicaid coverage to this above-poverty level population. By denying the Connecticut reform, the feds made it clear that going forward, any Medicaid expansion must be regarded as a de facto "roach motel" once a state gets in, it can never get out. Claims that the Obamacare expansion will be treated any differently must be viewed as either naïve or cynical." So you are willing to risk the financial health of the whole state of Michigan on a hope that we'll be allowed to kick people out in 4 years? Most of you will be gone at least from the House which is probably why the arbitrary 4 years was picked for when you would start kicking people off or should I say your successors will. Even the Governor will be out the door by then. If you can't make this tough decision today to not expand Medicaid, one which I consider a no brainer, are you telling me that in four years you're successors are going to make an even tougher decision to kick people off of it after they've been on it that long?

I also want to address The Governor's idea that you're going to put any extra money from the feds into a "lock box" to use later when they only pay us 90% of what the expansion costs. First off if they're paying us 100%, won't we use it all? Second, what happens when that runs out as it will? Third are the federal government's estimates ever right? Forth you're going to trust this federal government to do what they say? This government that uses funds we supply to them as a carrot in front of us to get us to do what they want us to do. This government that offers our funds back to us if we accept a top down federal government school program called common core and lies about the true people behind the scheme. Remember all the 55 MPH speed changes at the threat of losing highway funds? This can and will happen again.

We can't trust them no matter who is there, to actually follow through on any sort of promise. They have promised that we have privacy on our phones, that we have privacy on our internet, that we have privacy in our healthcare for which they even wrote special laws called Hippa. They've promised that the IRS won't play politics with who gets what designation of tax free status and who gets audited. But most shocking of all to me, we've been told it's never ok to just kill an American in our country or overseas without protections from the fourth amendment. Now we hear there are 4 American's who have been killed/assassinated at the order of the President, we still don't know the truth about Benghazi and this President is turning countries upside down all over the world taking out one dictator for another who slaughters peaceful Christian settlements of men women and a lot of beautiful children. We use drones ourselves and wipe out women and children in places like Libya. I'm hearing we have troops on the border of Syria. Whatever happened to acts of war being made when our troops are put in harm's way? Yes, I know this didn't start with him but it must end now. We have drones flying over our country and this president has requested to have an addition to the National Defense Authorization Act and received it, that says he can pick up anyone on American soil under

suspicion of terrorist ties with no proof, no Miranda rights, no notification of next of kin and no court trial and be held indefinitely. Remember who is on that Who's who of possible future terrorist activities list Janet Napolitano put out early in the first term of President Obama's Reign. I'm technically on that list at least 4 or 5 times and half the people in this room are on it at least once.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

If the federal government still followed that, maybe I'd be more likely to go along with what you're trying to do but that Amendment is as good as toilet paper to those in DC and that include almost all our US Legislators on both sides of the aisle from this state. But that's ok, you guys just go right ahead and give him and his unelected rulers who control ObamaCare, this huge power over our state. Give it to future presidents who follow behind him and think you're going to get your way.

The Supreme Court gave this task to you and us citizens through you to take down this unconstitutional law called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. They did so by their ruling about it being a tax. It determined that it was basically unconstitutional and that we states have to duty to treat it as such because it did not originate in the US House but in the Senate. That was a cue for you and legislatures and Governors of other states to take it down as unconstitutional. It is your duty as our Michigan legislature to determine constitutionality not the federal government.

We made them they did not make us. They are not our master or final arbiter of constitutionality. We the people and the states are. Just listen to these words taken right out of our constitution and no matter what any constitutional lawyer might say these are the true meaning of what is or isn't constitutional.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Footnotes:

As far as the tyranny part goes. Merriam Webster defines tyranny as

"1

: oppressive power <every form of *tyranny* over the mind of man — Thomas Jefferson>; especially: oppressive power exerted by government <the *tyranny* of a police state>

Piers Morgan said the other day,

"I've had some of the pro-gun lobbyists on here saying to me, well the reason we need to be armed is because of tyranny from our own government, and I've always laughed at them. I've always said don't be so ridiculous. Your government won't turn itself on you. But actually when you look at this [IRS scandal]... actually this is vaguely tyrannical behavior by the American government. I think what the IRS did is bordering on tyrannical behavior, I think what the Department of Justice has done to the Associated Press is bordering on tyrannical behavior."

InfoWars.com, by the way, is now publicly challenging Piers Morgan to admit the U.S. government has become "fully tyrannical," not just "bordering on tyrannical." It begs the question: If using the IRS as a political weapon to intimidate people over thought crimes, books, Facebook posts and prayers isn't full-on tyranny, what exactly will it take for Morgan to admit a full tyranny is now upon us? The government knocking on his door?

Joe Scarborough also admits gun owners were right all along

Going even further than Piers Morgan, "Morning Joe" host Joe Scarborough also admits gun owners were right all along, saying:

"I have been saying for months now... that I believe in background checks. After Newton, after Chicago, we need background checks. And my argument has been, don't worry, background checks aren't going to lead to a national registry. The government's never going to create a national registry, right? ... I don't have to even complete my sentence, do I? My argument is less persuasive today because of these scandals. Because people say hey, if they do that with the IRS, asking people what books you read, then how can I trust them with information about my Second Amendment rights? This is DEVASTATING! This IRS scandal is devastating all across the board..."

The core philosophy of liberals has just been shattered... government is not trustworthy and compassionate

To be a progressive / liberal person, you have to hold to the belief (i.e. have "faith") that governments can never go rogue. Governments can never become tyrannies. Governments are always and forever trustworthy and compassionate.

Every progressive government policy logically follows from those core beliefs: government should regulate what people eat, control how businesses run themselves, monopolize national health care, grant amnesty to undocumented illegal immigrants, take all the guns away from the citizens and concentrate power into its own hands. This is all justified because **you can trust the government, right?** ... RIGHT?

Enter exhibit A: The <u>IRS intimidation scandal</u>. The targeting of political enemies. Thought crimes. The IRS demands to know all your Facebook posts, the titles of the books you've recently read and even **the contents of your PRAYER!** The IRS then uses this information to selectively delay only the applications of non-profits that teach the Constitution, or patriotism, or are opposed to Obama. Can you say **criminal corruption** and total abuse of power? This is anti-American and traitorous!

Enter exhibit B: The Department of Justice, run by the nation's top criminal Eric Holder, runs <u>a vicious surveillance and secret police campaign</u> against none other than the Associated Press. When the outrageous behavior of the DoJ comes to light, Eric Holder claims, "I know nothing! Nothing!" (Same story for Obama... they knew nothing!)

Exhibit C: The <u>Benghazi narrative</u> pushed by the White House is now obviously a total lie, and this lie strongly influenced the presidential debates and 2012 election. The Benghazi attack was actually a terrorist attack -- and the White House knew it! But they covered it up, lied to the public, and even stood down U.S. forces to make sure the ambassador was killed so that he couldn't spill the beans on the U.S. weapons transfers being made to terror groups in Syria.

What do exhibits A, B and C prove? That you can't trust the government!

The illusion of trustworthy government has been destroyed

Now the illusion of trustworthy government has been completely shattered. If the IRS would selectively intimidate and threaten Constitutional groups it didn't like, what else is the government capable of?

All of a sudden those of us who warned everybody about gun confiscation, FEMA camps and false flags don't seem so outlandish anymore. Now almost everyone realizes **the government is capable of ANYTHING**. Especially the Obama administration, which respects no laws and no limits to its power. (Drone strikes, secret kill lists, the continued running of secret military prisons, bypassing Congress with executive orders, and so on.)

Now the Second Amendment makes total sense. Why do we even have a Second Amendment? The honest, blatant answer is so that as a last-ditch firewall against a tyrannical takeover, the American people can march on Washington with rifles in hand and shoot all the criminals dead. That is the essence of the Second Amendment -- a last-ditch failsafe for liberty. The only real way to keep government in line, after all, is to make sure those who hold office know that if they become outright traitors to America and refuse to abide by the limits of government described in the Constitution, **they might be shot dead** by citizens who take their country back by force. (I'm not calling for such an action, by the way. I'm only explaining the historical context of the Second Amendment and what it really means.)

When citizens are well armed and have the power to do such a thing, that power should never actually be needed because **the government fears the people** and thus stays within the limits of power. But when the people are disarmed, the government fears nothing and so expands out of control, functioning as a rogue, tyrannical cabal of mobsters and criminals. Read your history books if you don't believe me. This is the repeated story of government's rise and fall throughout history.

Ultimately, this is why the Obama administration wants to take your guns away: Not to make the children safer but to make the citizens defenseless against government tyranny. And yes, that tyranny exists right now. The debate is over. The gun grabbers lost and the Second Amendment won.

Now, the Obama administration is **permanently discredited**, and the strength of the Second Amendment movement is stronger than ever. Just as it should be.

So I want to thank Piers Morgan, Joe Scarborough and all the other gun control advocates who are now rethinking the logic of their positions and concluding the government can't be trusted after all. And if the government can't be trusted, then it only follows that **the citizens are the final defense against government tyranny**. Furthermore, that role of citizen defense is only viable if the citizens are well-armed with rifles and hi-capacity magazines.

The more the government knows there are millions of law-abiding citizens who are **armed and trained** in rifle skills, the less that government is likely to overstep its limited powers and try to concentrate power in its own hands.

Learn more:

http://www.naturalnews.com/040398 gun control trust in government tyranny.html#ixzz2Voozqgdn

Tom & Tina Dupont 2438 Red Rose Ln NE Rockford, MI 49341